

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sakaedani et al. (US 6,064,360), and claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakaedani et al. in view of Moon et al. (US 5,945,970). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon references, both singly and combined, that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recited in independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-7.

Independent claim 1 recites a discharging circuit for “sensing a power-off condition of the power supply line to short-circuit the first gate voltage supply line to the second gate voltage supply line when the power-off condition is sensed, thereby discharging voltages on the gate lines.” Initially, Applicant respectfully asserts that Sakaedani et al. discloses eliminating afterimage when a liquid crystal display is completely turned off, wherein the source voltage Vdd, the high gate voltage Vgh, and the low gate voltage Vgl generated therefrom are instantaneously changed to zero. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Sakaedani et al. fails to teach or suggest a discharging circuit “for sensing a power-off condition of the power supply line,” as recited by independent claim 1.

The Office Action alleges that the afterimage circuit 35 of Sakaedani et al. is a “discharging circuit” as claimed. In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, the afterimage circuit 35 of Sakaedani et al., as shown in FIG. 3, raises the potential of unselected gate lines 31 by about +2V to forcibly discharge the active switching element 31 by providing stored charge in the capacitor C1 to the gate line driver circuit 33 *when the supply of power to the liquid crystal display is stopped*. Thus, the afterimage circuit 35 of Sakaedani et al. fails to short-circuit the

first and second gate voltage lines “when the power-off condition is sensed,” as recited by independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Sakaedani et al. fails to teach or suggest every limitation recited by independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-7.

Applicant further asserts that the Office Action does not rely on Moon et al. to provide motivation to modify Sakaedani et al. Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that Moon et al. cannot provide proper motivation to modify Sakaedani et al.

In accordance with the above remarks, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because Sakaedani et al. and Moon et al., whether taken singly or combined, neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features of independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-7.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant’s undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 
David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: December 30, 2003

CUSTOMER NO. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 739-3000